

Some Models and Tools for Open Systems

Marco Faella¹

*Dipartimento di Scienze Fisiche
Università di Napoli “Federico II”, Italy*

*School of Engineering
University of California, Santa Cruz, USA*

Axel Legay²

*Department of Computer Science
University of Liège, Belgium*

*School of Engineering
University of California, Santa Cruz, USA*

Abstract

In computer science, there is a distinction between closed systems, whose behavior is totally determined in advance, and open systems, that are systems maintaining a constant interaction with an unspecified environment. Closed systems are naturally modeled by transitions systems. Open systems have been modeled in various ways, including process algebras, I/O automata, “modules”, and interfaces. Games provide a uniform setting in which all these models can be cast and compared.

In this extended abstract, we discuss the features and costs related to the game-based approach to open systems, referring to some of the existing models. Finally, we describe a new model of interface, called *sociable interface*, which is geared towards easier specification, improved reusability of models, and efficient symbolic implementation.

Key words: Interfaces, Games, Refinement, Symbolic Implementation.

1 Introduction

In computer system design, there is a distinction between *closed* and *open* systems. A closed system is a system whose behavior is totally determined by

¹ Supported by the NSF CAREER award CCR-0132780, and by the ARP award TO.030.MM.D.

² Supported by a F.R.I.A grant.

the state of the system, while an open system interacts with its environment and its behavior depends on those interactions. In practice, open systems are those that explicitly distinguish between internal choice, often represented by input events, and external choice, represented by output events.

Closed models are often used for specifying and verifying properties of systems whose behavior is totally known in advance. Open models are used to analyze systems that maintain an ongoing interaction with their environment, such as embedded systems and control systems. Moreover, open systems are suitable to represent components of larger systems, thus supporting compositional verification. In that case, inputs are supposed to be provided by the other components.

Closed systems are naturally modeled as transition systems. Basically, a transition system consists of a set of system states, and a set of transitions between the states. Transitions systems are naturally nondeterministic, which allows them to represent uncertainty or abstraction in the system model.

Several successful approaches for the design and verification of open systems are based on extensions of transition systems (for example, [LT89]). In a series of recent works [dA03,dAH04], de Alfaro et al. argue that *games* constitute a more natural model for open systems, not only for design and verification, but also for refinement and composition. Notice that in compositional verification, refinement and composition play a much more central role than in the traditional verification of closed systems.

Games generalize transition systems by providing a model for multiple independent sources of nondeterminism. Each source is represented by a player whose moves correspond to the choices available to that source. In particular, two-players games constitute an expressive model for open systems which allows the distinction between choices that originate within the system (output moves of the Output player), and the choices of the environment (input moves of the Input player).

Game models have been widely used to analyze and solve control problems for open system. The game view has also been used in the specification and verification of the interaction between components [ALW89], and the interaction between components and their environment [KVV01].

In this extended abstract, we discuss the features and the costs associated with fully game-based models for open systems (Section 2). We then make a short survey of recent works on open systems, focusing on communication paradigms, refinement and tool support (Section 3). We consider those frameworks that are more related to the interface models of de Alfaro et al., which are themselves the object of Section 4. Within Section 4, we also describe a new interface model, called *sociable interfaces*, which is geared towards easier specification, improved reusability of models, and efficient symbolic implementation.

2 Game-based Models

In this section, we briefly survey the features of game-based models for design, verification, refinement, and composition of open systems. A more complete discussion can be found in [dA03].

2.1 Design

In contrast to many transition system-based approaches such as [LT89], a game model needs not be *input-enabled*. This means that at every state, some inputs can be illegal. By not accepting certain inputs, the model allows to express the assumption that the environment never generates these inputs (such an approach is often referred to as being “optimistic”). In this way, environment assumptions can be used to encode restrictions on the order of the method calls, and the types of return values and exceptions. Moreover, the ability to forbid inputs removes the need to specify “what happens” when taking an undesirable input. Such a specification has been pointed to as one of the main drawbacks of input-enabled approaches.

2.2 Refinement

The notion of refinement aims at capturing the relation between an abstract model of a component and a more detailed one, or between a model expressing a specification and a model describing an implementation. Refinement should satisfy the following *substitutability* condition. If P refines Q , then it should be possible to replace Q with P in every context and obtain an equivalent system.

When considering transition systems, refinement is often defined as trace inclusion or simulation. Essentially, all the behaviors of the implementation must also be behaviors of the specification. However, such behavior containment is not an appropriate notion of refinement for open systems, because it allows the implementation to accept less inputs than the specification, thus violating substitutability.

One solution is to impose the input-enabledness of all components. However, by definition this restriction hampers the ability of the model to express input assumptions. As a consequence, sometimes (see [dA03]), proving refinement requires to explicitly model the environment, thus closing the system.

Alternatively, de Alfaro et al. suggest to replace trace inclusion or simulation with a notion that is contravariant with respect to inputs and outputs. More precisely, if P refines Q , then

- (i) P accepts at least as many input behaviors as Q does. This means that P can be used in each environment in where Q can be used;
- (ii) moreover, when P and Q are subject to the same input behavior, P should produce a subset of the output of Q .

If P and Q are both modeled as two-player games between an Input player and an Output player, then the above definition leads to using alternating simulation or alternating trace inclusion [AHKV98] as the refinement relation.

2.3 Composition

Composition is a basic operation for open systems. Indeed, one of the motivations for open systems is the ability to combine them in larger units. Clearly, we expect components to interact, or communicate, when composed.

A fundamental communication mode is action synchronization. When two models are composed, if a model has an enabled transition that emits the action a and the other has an enabled transition that receives the action a , they will both take their respective transition, thus synchronizing on a . This mechanism is common to both process algebras (see for instance Section 3.3) and automata models (see Sections 3.1 and 4).

What changes is the way in which *missed synchronization* is handled. Consider two components being composed. One case of missed synchronization occurs when a component can produce fewer outputs than the other one can accept as input. All models agree that this case does not represent an error.

On the other hand, assume that a component generates more outputs than the other one can accept as input. In some approaches, such as process algebra, if a component proposes two outputs but the environment can only accept one of the two, the other output does not happen, and no error is flagged. In some application domains, this is not the intended behavior, and in Section 3.3, a technique is proposed that flags an error when the above situation occurs.

The I/O automata model of Section 3.1 solves the problem by enforcing the input-enabled principle. In that case, no problematic missed synchronizations can happen. However, as it has been pointed out in the previous sections, such a constraint has a deep influence on the design and refinement of the system.

Game models, such as the interfaces of Section 4, stipulate that output choice takes precedence over input choice and introduce a notion of compatibility. Consider two components P and Q , in one state of the composition, if P wants to do an output that cannot be accepted by an input of Q , then incompatibility occurs. While many approaches would consider the two components to be incompatible in such a case, the interface approach is optimistic, by expecting the environment to steer away from error states. More concretely, two components are compatible if there exists a way (an environment) to use the components together, and ensure that the environment assumptions of both are met.

2.4 Costs

It should come as no surprise that the increased expressivity of game-based models over transition systems comes at a cost. As far as refinement is con-

cerned, while trace inclusion is PSPACE-complete, its alternating version is EXPTIME-complete. However, both simulation and its alternating version can be computed in polynomial time [AHKV98].

As for model checking, game models support more elaborate and therefore more costly properties. For instance, a common type of property for transition systems is *safety*: checking that the system remains in a safe area of its state space. Since game models recognize two types of non-determinism, two types of safety properties can be of interest. First, safety under all environments, or equivalently under the worst environment (pessimistic). Checking such properties is tantamount to checking safety in transition systems, as both the system and the environment cooperate in trying to leave the safe area.

Second, safety under the most favorable environment (optimistic). In this version, the two sources of non-determinism play in opposite roles: the system trying to break free of the safe area, and the environment trying to keep the system in it. Checking this type of properties is in general more complicated than checking safety in transition systems.

3 Some Models for Open Systems

In this section, we shortly survey some of the existing models for the design and the verification of open systems. This section is clearly not exhaustive, and is mainly intended to show the variety of models that have been proposed to deal with open systems.

3.1 I/O Automata

This section is devoted to a short presentation of the well-known *Input/Output automata* model (I/O automata for short) [LT89]. An I/O automaton is essentially a non-deterministic finite-state automaton with actions labeling each transition. Actions are classified as either *input*, *output*, or *internal*. As usual for open systems, output and internal actions are issued by the automaton, while input actions are issued by the environment. I/O automata are input-enabled: in each state all inputs are allowed.

I/O automata can be composed to yield other I/O automata. Two I/O automata communicate by synchronizing on shared actions (i.e. actions with the same name). If an I/O automaton generates an output action, then this action is transmitted to all other automata having the same action as input. This composition is similar to the one provided in CSP in the sense that I/O automata use simultaneous performance of actions to synchronize components. However, it is slightly different since the synchronization is leaded only by one automaton: the one that is issuing the output action. Moreover, if two automata synchronize on the same action, the resulting action is not hidden, to allow broadcasting.

One cannot compose two I/O automata if they have a common output

action. As explained in [LT89], this is to ensure that only one component leads the composition. However, this restriction, in addition to the fact that input and output actions of each components are disjoint, restricts the possible communication patterns between them.

Since the I/O automata are input-enabled, refinement can be captured by trace containment or simulation. However, sometimes (see [dA03]), proving refinement requires to explicitly model the environment, thus closing the system.

There are various languages for specifying I/O automata. One of the main difficulties in the specification is expressing the input-enabled principle. The process-algebraic languages proposed in [Vaa95, NS95] ensure input-enabledness by filling in *default transitions* for missing input transitions. Those default transitions are either *self-loops* [Vaa95], or lead to a special state (often called error state) in where the behavior of the environment is supposed to be random [NS95]. The drawback of such languages is that sometimes, specifications need transitions that are self-loops, and other transitions that go to an error state. In [SCS03], Stark et al. solve the problem by employing a notion of well-typedness of terms which guarantees that all well-typed terms are input-enabled.

Another specification language is the IOA language, introduced by Lynch in [GL98]. The language allows the designer to express designs at different levels of abstraction, leading to a low-level description that can be translated to real code. The language is implemented in the *IOA toolset* [GL00].

The I/O automata model is now highly popular for specifying and verifying distributed algorithms both manually, and with machine assistance. As an example, Nipkow and Slind implement the I/O automata model in the theorem prover *Isabelle* to verify communication protocols [NS94].

It should be mentioned that there exist many variants of I/O automata such as *probabilistic I/O automata* [WSS94] that are used to describe systems that exhibit concurrent and probabilistic behaviors, or *hybrid I/O automata* [LSV03] that are used to describe systems with a mixed discrete-continuous semantics.

3.2 The Ptolemy II Project

In the Ptolemy II project [Lee], Lee and others focus on component-based heterogeneous modeling and design, more in particular on embedded systems. The work done on this project is too vast to be presented in this section³, and we will only focus on the part that use a game-based approach.

In Ptolemy II, components are called *actors* and they communicate by means of communication channels called *receivers*. The communication is based on a producer/consumer model. In fact, receivers just provide an interface that contains methods like `put` or `get` to send or receive data from the

³ The interested reader is redirected to [Lee] for many references on the project.

channels they represent.

The choice of the communication domain is left to the classes that implement the receiver interfaces. Among the available communication domains, one finds CSP (Communicating sequential processes), PN (Process Networks), SDF (synchronous data flow), DE (discrete event), etc. Most of those domains are detailed in [LX03, Lee]

Different domains impose different requirements for actors. As an example, in the SDF domain actors assume that data is always available when they call `get`, while in CSP, they wait the data in a rendez-vous communication style. One of the main challenges here is to ensure that an actor can work correctly with a receiver.

One of the solutions proposed in Ptolemy II is based on an action-based interface formalism (see Section 4) that is used to describe the method calls and receive of actors and receivers. More precisely, the actors and the receivers are modeled as action-based interfaces whose actions are both the method calls and returns. Then, an actor and a receiver can work together if their composition is not empty.

Ptolemy II also employs alternating simulation. However, this is not to check if an implementation refines its specification but to check if a domain is a *sub-type* of another one. Using alternating simulation, one can define a partial order relation between domains. As it is explained in [LX03], this partial order can be used to design actors that can work in multiple domains.

3.3 Stuck-free Conformance

In two recent works [RR02, FHRR04], Rajamani et al. study a form of compatibility theory for CCS processes called “stuck-free conformance”. In this theory, a model is a CCS process, and composition is the standard parallel composition in this process algebra [Mil80].

CCS processes communicate via synchronization on shared actions. Multiple processes can share the same actions, both as input and as output. However, at any given computation step, an output can synchronize with exactly one corresponding input, giving rise to an internal action. The basic communication mode is thus many-to-one.

Given a set of actions A , a module is said to be *stuck* on A if, once communication on A is forbidden (*restricted* in CCS terminology), the module still has pending actions in A . In other words, the module should never try to send a message to the environment using an action in A , nor it should receive input actions in A . Thus, stuck-freedom is only checked once the system has been closed by the restriction operator. The theory is enriched by a refinement relation, called *conformance*, that preserves stuck-freedom.

The conformance check is one of the refinement relations supported by the

tool ZING⁴ [AQR⁺04]. This tool accepts a rich input language and builds an enumerative finite-state model of it. Additionally, ZING is capable of extracting its models from common programming languages. Thus, it is possible to use ZING to automatically check whether a concrete software implementation refines its specification (called *contract* in the ZING literature). In [FHRR04], the authors report that the tool was successfully used in this fashion, leading to the discovery of several bugs in a distributed software system.

3.4 Game Semantics

In a series of recent papers [AGMO03, AGMO04], Abramsky, Ghica and others outline the application of game semantics [Abr97] to the automatic analysis and verification of software. Concurrency is not treated in these works.

The basic idea of game semantics is to interpret each term in a programming language as a game between the program and its environment. For instance the r-value “ x ”, where x is an integer variable, is interpreted as a game where the program asks the value of “ x ” to the environment, and the environment answers with an integer. If such term is inserted in a context where “ x ” has been assigned a certain value “ c ”, then the environment will be forced to reply “ c ” to the program’s question. So, this formalism allows for a completely compositional semantics. Moreover, the semantics is fully abstract, in that programs that are observationally equivalent correspond to the same game.

A tool has been built to automatically build the game associated with a program, in the form of a finite graph, whose edges are labeled by moves of the program and the environment. This graph can be interpreted as a labeled transition system and fed into a traditional model-checker, to check pessimistic properties of the type “for all environments, φ ”.

3.5 Modular Verification of Features

Feature-oriented design is a field where large systems are partitioned in a set of modules, each of which representing a feature of the system. Features are represented by finite-state machines, and they are *sequentially* composed by linking the final states of one feature to the initial state of another.

In [LKF02, BFKH04], the authors explore the idea of treating each feature as an open model, enabling compositional verification of CTL properties.

Given a CTL property φ , algorithms are provided to generate constraints that the environment (the other features) must satisfy in order for the composed system to satisfy φ . Dually, each feature provides a set of guarantees to the environment, in the form of the so-called *data environment*.

Albeit different in scope, and based on sequential rather than parallel composition, this theory exhibits the main ingredients of the interface approach

⁴ ZING needs the commercial package “Visual Studio .NET 2003” to function.

to open systems, which we treat in the following section.

4 Interface Models

Recently, we have proposed a game-based model called *sociable interfaces* [dAdSF⁺05]. The state of a sociable interface consists of a value assignment to a set of variables. Variables are partitioned into *local* variables, that are owned by a specific interface, and *global* ones, that can be updated by any interface.

Synchronization and communication are based on two main ideas. The first idea is that the same action can appear as a label of both input and output transitions: when the action labels output transitions, it means that the interface can emit the action; when the action labels an input transition, it means that the action can be accepted if sent from other components. Depending on whether the action labels only input transitions, only output transitions, or both kind of transitions, we have different synchronization schemes.

For instance, if an action a is associated only with output transitions, it means that the interface can emit a , but cannot receive it, and thus it cannot be composed with any other interface that emits a . Conversely, if a is associated only with input transitions, it means that the interface accepts a from other interfaces, but will not emit a . Finally, if a is associated both with input and output transitions, it means that the interface can both emit a , and accept a when emitted by other interfaces.

The second idea is that global variables do not belong to specific interfaces: the same global variable can be updated by multiple interfaces. In an interface, the output transitions associated with an action specifies how global variables can be updated when the interface emits the action; the input transition associated with an action specifies constraints on how other interfaces can update the global variables when emitting the action. By limiting the sets of variables whose value must be tracked by the interfaces, and by introducing appropriate non-interference conditions among interfaces, we can ensure that interfaces can participate in complex communication schemes with limited knowledge about the other participants. In particular, interfaces do not need to know in advance the number or identities of the other interfaces that take part in communication schemes. This facilitates component reuse, as the same interface model can be used in different contexts.

We have implemented the theory of sociable interfaces in a tool called TIC (for *Tool for Interface Compatibility*). For the tool to handle interesting interfaces, we represent the state-space of an interface and its transition relations symbolically, i.e. using MDDs/BDDs. The tool takes as input interfaces specified in a guarded-command style language. Then, the user has the options of performing the following operations: *(i)* compose two interfaces, *(ii)* verify refinement between two interfaces, and *(iii)* check safety properties of an interface. All of the above operations can be computed efficiently using

our symbolic representation. We are currently working on extending both the theory and the implementation to discrete real-time systems.

Previous game-based models, such as interface automata [dAH01a,dAH04] and interface modules [dAH01b,CdAHM02] were based on either actions, or variables, but not both. The rest of this section is devoted to a quick presentation of such interface models.

4.1 Variable-based Interface Formalisms

In variable-based interface formalisms, such as the formalisms of [dAH01b,CdAHM02], communication is mediated by input and output variables, and the system evolves in synchronous steps. It is well known that synchronous, variable-based models can also encode communication via actions [AH99]: the generation of an output $a!$ is translated into the toggling of the value of an (output) boolean variable x_a , and the reception of an input $a?$ is encoded by forcing a transition to occur whenever the (input) variable x_a is toggled. This encoding is made more attractive by syntactic sugar [AH99]. However, this encoding prevents the modeling of many-to-one and many-to-many communication.

In fact, due to the synchronous nature of the formalism, a variable can be modified at most by one module: if two modules modified it, there would be no simple way to determine its updated value.⁵ Since the generation of an output $a!$ is modeled by toggling the value of a boolean variable x_a , this limitation indicates that an output action can be emitted at most by one module. As a consequence, we cannot write modules that can accept inputs from multiple sources: every module must know precisely which other modules can provide inputs to it, so that distinct communication actions can be used. The advance knowledge of the modules involved in communication hampers module re-use.

4.2 Action-based Interface Formalisms

Action-based interfaces, such as the models of [dAH01a,dA03,dAH04], enable a natural encoding of asynchronous communication. However, two interfaces could be composed only if they did not share output actions.

Furthermore, action-based formalisms lacked a notion of global variables which are visible to all the modules of a system. Such global variables are a very powerful and versatile modeling paradigm, providing a notion of global, shared state. Mimicking global variables in purely action-based models is rather inconvenient: it requires encapsulating every global variable by a module, whose state corresponds to the value of the variable. Read and write accesses to the variable must then be translated to appropriate sequences of input and output actions, leading to cumbersome models.

⁵ A possible way out would be to define that, in case of simultaneous updates, only one of the updates occurs nondeterministically. This choice, however, would lead to a complex semantics, and to complex analysis algorithms.

References

- [Abr97] S. Abramsky. Games in the semantics of programming languages. In *Proc. of the 11th Amsterdam Colloquium*, pages 1–6. ILLC, Dept. of Philosophy, University of Amsterdam, 1997.
- [AGMO03] S. Abramsky, D. Ghica, A. Murawski, and L. Ong. Algorithmic game semantics and component-based verification. In *Proc. of SAVCBS: Specification and Verification of Component-Based Systems*, 2003.
- [AGMO04] S. Abramsky, D. Ghica, A. Murawski, and L. Ong. Applying game semantics to compositional software modeling and verifications. In *Proc. of TACAS: Tools and Algorithms for the Construction and Analysis of Systems*, volume 2988 of *Lect. Notes in Comp. Sci.* Springer-Verlag, 2004.
- [AH99] R. Alur and T.A. Henzinger. Reactive modules. *Formal Methods in System Design*, 15:7–48, 1999.
- [AHKV98] R. Alur, T.A. Henzinger, O. Kupferman, and M.Y. Vardi. Alternating refinement relations. In *CONCUR 98: Concurrency Theory. 9th Int. Conf.*, volume 1466 of *Lect. Notes in Comp. Sci.*, pages 163–178. Springer-Verlag, 1998.
- [ALW89] M. Abadi, L. Lamport, and P. Wolper. Realizable and unrealizable concurrent program specifications. In *Proc. 16th Int. Colloq. Aut. Lang. Prog.*, volume 372 of *Lect. Notes in Comp. Sci.*, pages 1–17. Springer-Verlag, 1989.
- [AQR⁺04] T. Andrews, S. Qadeer, S. K. Rajamani, J. Rehof, and Y. Xie. Zing: Exploiting program structure for model checking concurrent software. In *CONCUR 04: Concurrency Theory. 15th Int. Conf.*, *Lect. Notes in Comp. Sci.* Springer-Verlag, 2004.
- [BFKH04] C. Blundell, K. Fisler, S. Krishnamurthi, and P. Van Hentenryck. Parameterized interfaces for open system verification of product lines. In *IEEE International Conference on Automated Software Engineering (ASE’04)*, pages 258–267, 2004.
- [CdAHM02] A. Chakrabarti, L. de Alfaro, T.A. Henzinger, and F.Y.C. Mang. Synchronous and bidirectional component interfaces. In *CAV 02: Proc. of 14th Conf. on Computer Aided Verification*, volume 2404 of *Lect. Notes in Comp. Sci.*, pages 414–427. Springer-Verlag, 2002.
- [dA03] L. de Alfaro. Game models for open systems. In *Proceedings of the International Symposium on Verification (Theory in Practice)*, volume 2772 of *Lect. Notes in Comp. Sci.* Springer-Verlag, 2003.
- [dAdSF⁺05] L. de Alfaro, L. D. da Silva, M. Faella, A. Legay, P. Roy, and M. Sorea. Sociable interfaces. In *FRODOS 05: Proc. of 5th International Workshop on Frontiers of Combining Systems*, *Lect. Notes in Comp. Sci.* Springer-Verlag, 2005. to appear.

- [dAH01a] L. de Alfaro and T.A. Henzinger. Interface automata. In *Proceedings of the 8th European Software Engineering Conference and the 9th ACM SIGSOFT Symposium on the Foundations of Software Engineering (ESEC/FSE)*, pages 109–120. ACM Press, 2001.
- [dAH01b] L. de Alfaro and T.A. Henzinger. Interface theories for component-based design. In *EMSOFT 01: 1st Intl. Workshop on Embedded Software*, volume 2211 of *Lect. Notes in Comp. Sci.*, pages 148–165. Springer-Verlag, 2001.
- [dAH04] L. de Alfaro and T.A. Henzinger. Interface-based design. In *Engineering Theories of Software Intensive Systems, proceedings of the Marktoberdorf Summer School*. Kluwer, 2004.
- [FHRR04] C. Fournet, C. A. R. Hoare, S. K. Rajamani, and J. Rehof. Stuck-free conformance. In *CAV 04: Proc. of 16th Conf. on Computer Aided Verification*, pages 242–254, 2004.
- [GL98] S. J. Garland and N. Lynch. The IOA language and toolset: Support for designing, analyzing, and building distributed systems. Technical report, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, MA, 1998.
- [GL00] S. J. Garland and N. Lynch. Using I/O automata for developing distributed systems. In *Foundations of component-based systems*, pages 285–312. Cambridge University Press, 2000.
- [KVW01] Orna Kupferman, Moshe Y. Vardi, and Pierre Wolper. Module checking. *Information and Computation*, 164:322–344, 2001.
- [Lee] E. Lee. The Ptolemy II project. <http://ptolemy.eecs.berkeley.edu>.
- [LKF02] H. Li, S. Krishnamurthi, and K. Fisler. Verifying cross-cutting features as open systems. In *SIGSOFT '02/FSE-10: 10th ACM SIGSOFT symposium on Foundations of software engineering*, pages 89–98. ACM Press, 2002.
- [LSV03] N. Lynch, R. Segala, and F. Vaandraager. Hybrid I/O automata. *Information and Computation*, 185:105–157, 2003.
- [LT89] N. Lynch and M. R. Tuttle. An introduction to Input/Output automata. *CWI-quarterly*, 2(3), 1989.
- [LX03] E. A. Lee and Y. Xiong. A behavioral type system and its application in Ptolemy II. *Formal Aspect of Computing Journal*, 2003.
- [Mil80] R. Milner. *A Calculus of Communicating Systems*, volume 92 of *Lect. Notes in Comp. Sci.* Springer-Verlag, 1980.
- [NS94] T. Nipkow and K. Slind. I/O automata in Isabelle/HOL. In *Proc of TYPES 94*, *Lect. Notes in Comp. Sci.* Springer-Verlag, 1994.
- [NS95] R. De Nicola and R. Segala. A process algebraic view of input/output automata. *Theor. Comp. Sci.*, 138, 1995.

- [RR02] S. K. Rajamani and J. Rehof. Conformance checking for models of asynchronous message passing software. In *CAV 02: Proc. of 14th Conf. on Computer Aided Verification*, pages 166–179. Springer-Verlag, 2002.
- [SCS03] E. Stark, R. Cleavland, and A. Smolka. A process-algebraic language for probabilistic I/O automata. In *CONCUR 03: Concurrency Theory. 14th Int. Conf.*, Lect. Notes in Comp. Sci., pages 189–2003. Springer-Verlag, 2003.
- [Vaa95] F. Vaandraager. On the relationship between process algebra and input/output automata. In *Proc. 10th IEEE Symp. Logic in Comp. Sci.*, 1995.
- [WSS94] S. H. Wu, A. Smolka, and E. W. Stark. Compositionality and full abstraction for probabilistic I/O automata. In *CONCUR 94: Concurrency Theory. 5th Int. Conf.*, Lect. Notes in Comp. Sci. Springer-Verlag, 1994.